

REMARKS

The amendment in the last line of claim 1 and at page 3, line 25 finds basis at page 5, lines 13-16. It is clear that the cinching effect described at page 5, lines 13-16 could not take place unless x_1 is greater than x_2 . Therefore, amendment of claim 1 and Summary of the Invention at page 3 to be in agreement with the statement at page 5 does not present an issue of new matter. It would be clear to anyone considering the invention that it would not work (cinch) unless x_1 is greater than x_2 such as stated at page 5, lines 13-16. Claim 1 is now in agreement with the statement at page 5, lines 13-16.

On page 2 of the Office Action, claims 3 and 4 stand rejected under 35 USC 112 as being indefinite. Claims 3 and 4 are stated to contain improper Markush groups. It is respectfully requested that this rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn as the applicant has inserted the Examiner's kindly suggested amendment into claims 3 and 4 in order to make the claims contain proper Markush groups.

On page 3 of the Office Action, claim 1 stands rejected under 35 USC 103 as being unpatentable over Akao et al (802) in view of Frazzitta et al (028). Akao is stated to show that it is known to carry out a method of manufacturing a winding device comprising the step of providing an injection molded support structure having an outer web wrapping surface. The Examiner notes that Akao does not discuss the surface texture of the outer surface. The Examiner states that Frazzitta shows that it is known to carry out a method for making a web winding device wherein an outer web wrapping surface has a surface texture less than 0.5 microns Ra. The Examiner notes that Frazzitta does not disclose relative static coefficient of friction but that it is inherent to and dependent upon the surface texture of the wrapping surface. The Examiner states that since Frazzitta suggests the claimed surfaced texture that it is combinable with Akao because they are concerned with a similar technical field, namely, web winding devices. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Akao has no teaching of controlling the surface texture of a winding core. It is counterintuitive that a smooth course such as instantly claimed would be desirable. Further, it is noted that Akao utilizes a film core that has a slot 7 for inserting the film. Such a core does not rely on frictional attachment to the core. There is no disclosure suggestion to modify Akao to not have the slot 7

or to have a surface such as disclosed in Frazzitta et al. Frazzitta et al. does not disclose a similar technology to Akao. Frazzitta does not disclose a web winding device. The smooth core of Frazzitta is utilized in smoothing a layer that is formed in the Frazzitta technique. No winding takes place. Therefore, there is no disclosure or suggestion to modify Akao to have a surface such as claimed, and indeed Akao would teach away from surface modification as a film slot 7 is present. Therefore, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

In the portion of the Office Action bridging pages 3, 4, and 5, claims 2-5 stand rejected under 35 USC 103 as being unpatentable over Akao and Frazzitta, further in view of Schneider et al. (543). The Examiner states that Schneider discloses materials such as claimed in claims 2-5. The Examiner states it be obvious to use these materials in Akao's molding process in order to produce an article such as claimed. This rejection is respectfully traversed. As urged above, there is no disclosure to form a smooth winding surface such as claimed in claim 1 by any combination of Akao and Frazzitta. Schneider, while disclosing polymers similar to those claimed, does not provide any disclosure or suggestion to form a core surface such as instantly claimed in claim 1. Schneider is drawn to the utilization of a hub that has elastomeric ribs between concentric hubs. There is no disclosure of the surface of the Schneider core. Therefore, there is no disclosure suggestion in any combination of Akao, Frazzitta, and Schneider that would lead one to the instant invention.

Therefore, it is respectfully requested that the rejections under 35 USC 112 and 35 USC 103 be reconsidered and withdrawn and that an early Notice of Allowance be issued in this application.

Respectfully submitted,



Attorney for Applicant(s)
Registration No. 26,664

Paul A. Leipold/rgd
Rochester, NY 14650
Telephone: 585-722-5023
Facsimile: 585-477-1148